



DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231

	APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR		ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	
	09/782,680	02/12/01	THOMAS		С	CDTP001C
Γ		($\overline{}$		EXAMINER
	C. DOUGLASS 1193 CAPRI		TM02/081()	HECKL ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	CAMPBELL CA	95008			2182 DATE MAILED:	\mathcal{U}
						08/10/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

<i>(</i>	09/182,680 THOMAS ET AL				
Office Action Summary	04782,680				
	Examiner Heckl	Group Art Unit 2182			
—The MAILING DATE of this communication app	pears on the cover sheet b	eneath the correspondence address			
Period for Response	1 //))			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE I MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.	IS SET TO EXPIRE 5 (U.V	MONTH(S) FROM THE			
 Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 Cl from the mailing date of this communication. If the period for response specified above is less than thirty (30) d If NO period for response is specified above, such period shall, by Failure to respond within the set or extended period for response 	lays, a response within the statuto default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS	ory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. If from the mailing date of this communication .			
Status					
☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on					
✓ This action is FINAL.					
☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance exc accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> ,					
Disposition of Claims					
⊠ Claim(s)		is/are pending in the application.			
Of the above claim(s)		is/are withdrawn from consideration.			
□ Claim(s)	is/are allowed.				
✓ Claim(s) ✓	is/are rejected.				
☐ Claim(s)		is/are objected to.			
☐ Claim(s)————————————————————————————————————		•			
Application Papers		requirement.			
☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Dra	wing Review, PTO-948.				
☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.					
☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are objected to by the Examiner.					
☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.					
☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)					
 □ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priorit □ All □ Some* □ None of the CERTIFIED copies □ received. 	•				
received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Nureceived in this national stage application from the					
*Certified copies not received:		•			
Attachment(s)					
☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper	er No(s) 🔲 I	nterview Summary, PTO-413			
XNotice of References Cited, PTO-892		Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152			
☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTC)-948	Other			
O	ffice Action Summary				

Art Unit: 2182

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See In re Goodman, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); In re Longi, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); In re Van Ornum, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); In re Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, In re Thorington, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321© may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claim 1 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting over claim 1 of U. S. Patent No. 5,752,011 since the claim, if allowed, would improperly extend the "right to exclude" already granted in the patent.

The subject matter claimed in the instant application is fully disclosed in the patent and is covered by the patent since the patent and the application are claiming common subject matter, as follows: varying the clock frequency to a processor depending on the temperature of the processor.

Furthermore, there is no apparent reason why applicant was prevented from presenting claims corresponding to those of the instant application during prosecution of the application which

Art Unit: 2182

matured into a patent. See *In re Schneller*, 397 F.2d 350, 158 USPQ 210 (CCPA 1968). See also MPEP § 804.

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371© of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

4. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by Pippin (5,838,578).

This reference teaches a computer comprising a clock (Fig. 7 elements 710, 720), processor 705, temperature sensor 100 wherein the frequency of the clock varies with the temperature of the processor (column 2 lines 31-60).

- 5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
- 6. This is a continuation of applicant's earlier Application Nos. 09/351,051, 08/914,299, and 08/262,754. All claims are

Art Unit: 2182

drawn to the same invention claimed in the earlier application and could have been finally rejected on the grounds and art of record in the next Office action if they had been entered in the earlier application. Accordingly, THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL even though it is a first action in this case. See MPEP § 706.07(b). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no, however, event will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tom Heckler whose telephone number is (703) 305-9666.

Art Unit: 2182

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Technology Center receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

TH
August 8, 2001

THOMAS M. HECKLER PRIMARY EXAMINER